PRESIDENT'S LETTER.

150 Rucher

The New Haven Palladium contains the following reply to the President's answer to the memorial of the 'forty clergymen' of Connecticut:

TO HIS EXCELLENCY JAMES BUCHANAN,

President of the United States. In July last a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of August 15, 1857, in a manner which shows under date of August 15, 1807, in a manner which shows that you misunderstood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, a large part of the memorialists have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial, or are explicitly accord in your reply. These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is, that the people shall make their onen lanes and elect their onen rulers." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the material facts alleged by your memorialists, and which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through Gov. Walker, but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the and doings through Gov. Walker, but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial. The facts stand in the memorial, then, uncontradicted by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are those assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue, and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, what can you expect your memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental prin-As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle, though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when in sight of the ruin liberty and religion in exile will together weep over the desceration.

Your FORMAL VINDERTON PART depends notice. Your FORMAL VINDICATION next demands notice.

Of this your memorialists are compelled to say that in their view, it is entirely groundless and un

Resting it solely on what you call "the plainest and most palpable historical facts," you say that at the time of your imaguration "you found, in fact, the govern-ment of Kansas as well established as that of any other You then ask, was it not my duty to sustain Territory. Tou then ask, was to the my duty to sessain this government—to prevent it from being overturned by force—in the language of the constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed?" You then add: inat the laws be lattifully executed?" You then add:
"It was for this purpose that I ordered a military force to
Kansas to act as a posse comitatus in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the laws into execution." Here, then,
is the distinct admission and declaration on your part
that you ordered a military force to Kansas for the purpose of sustaining its territorial government, and of en-forcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your

memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question, on which the whole controversy turns, is thus raised. It is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws, in Kansas, in the just, proper, and authorised meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If

will know something which they have yet to learn. If will know something which they have yet to tearn. It can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth, that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which

Here your memorialists take the position that NOTHING TY, AND THAT NOTHING SHOULD BE TREATED AS GOVERNMENT

OR LAW WHICH PRESENTS NO EVIDENCE OF AUTHORITY.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our constitution and our political institutions, whatever be its name or form, our political institutions, whatever be its name of form, be justly regarded as government or law having authority under our constitution? Can such an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents! Can usurpation beget a valid government or law, or impart that right to govern which implies an obligation to obey? Its might may make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission but can usurpation create an obligation to ission, but can usurpation create an obligation to

Suppose the Great Mogul, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and arms—would any citizen of the United States call them "government and laws" except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government government? Are bogus laws laws? Is this "government established?" and are these "laws enacted?" and yet known to possess no other or higher authority than that derived from Beacher. laws? Is this "government established?" and are these
"laws enacted?" and yet known to possess no other or
higher authority than that derived from Border Rurplants! Are "We, the people of the United States" to
be stultified into the belief of such a dogma? For that
result wait, at least, for the more absolute dominion of a

Your memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognising the territorial government and laws of Kansas as a genuine government and valid laws, you have peras a genume government and the verted the general principle upon which you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and

That general principle may be thus stated: When rules of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power, it is the duty of the people and the executors of law to recognise them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of giving practical authority to law, and of the view of the properties rightener and analysis of the view o only means of giving practical authority to law, and of preventing violence and anarchy; nor do they yield to any man, or class of men, a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it than themselves cherish. But to say that ALL governments and ALL laws, claiming to be valid, must be recognised, executed, and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general rule for a universal rule, the condition for an unconrule for a uncertail rule, the condition for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in the view of your memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In recognising the territorial government and laws as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition that the not wholly disregarded the essential condition that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some axidmes of rightful authority? You recognise the territorial laws as valid. What is this but to act upon the principle that, when the so-called government and laws come before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and violent usurpation, that even then—even in a case so flagrant— it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your memorialists are here anxious to call your atten-on to an important distinction, which you appear en-rely to overlook. They readily concede that, in cases of no unfrequent occurrence, one government may properly recognise another as authoritative, or as a government de facte, on a very low degree of evidence, without rigidly de facto, on a very low degree of evidence, without rigidly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was enthroned in France by the army of the Empire, and with the acquiescence and consent of the people, had no right to interfere with a government thus "established." The British, as a foreign government, had no right of question or of control in the matter. But does it follow, because the government of Great Britain had no right to interfere with what was an undeniable

THE NEW HAVEN LEGISLATORS-REPLY TO THE | Can Congress or the President abandon this right, or the Can Congress or the President abandon this right, or the
duty which arises from it? If this government owes any
duty whatever to the country, is it not most sacredly
bound to protect both State and Territory against the imposition of a government and laws by a ruffian and violent invasion from another State? Your memorialists,
then, strenuously insist that the only principle on which
recognition can ever be justified is that there is some evidence, be it more or less, that the government processes
FROM AN ACTHORISES LAW-MARING FOWER. And they further insist that when such government is within our own
borders, under the supervision and control of the federal
government, and claiming to derive all its sanction from
a law of Congress, THE EVIDENCE OF ITS AUTHORITY MUST BE a law of Congress, the evidence of its authority must be track and decisive. But how is it when there is no such CLEAR AND DECISIVE. chear and decisive. But now is the which there is strong against its authority? How is it when there is the best evidence the case admits of, even decisive, unquestionable proof, that the so-called government has no other authority than ruffianism and outrage? Is such a "government" to be practically recognised, and that, too, within the limits of our own republic? There surely may be cases in which it would be a gross wrong to sustain a territorial government which has no authority. And now, we ask, what government could you refuse to sustain, if not one that had its origin solent in a violent invasion of ruffians rom another State? This fact in the present case can be denied; so can God, when His sun shineth in the heav-

This usurped government cannot be sanctioned by the law of Congress authorizing the formation of a territorial government. That law declares that "the true intent and meaning of this act is to leave the people (of the Territory) perfectly free to regulate their domestic in-stitutions in their own way, subject only to the consti-tution of the United States." To THE PEOPLE, and them alone, it expressly gives the right to make their own government and laws. Here is no sanction, no authorigovernment and laws. Here is no sanction, no authority, for a government not framed by the people, but founded solely on invasion. Can this law enthrone in rightful sovereignty bandits from a neighboring State?

As well say that it authorized them to seize every acre of Kansas for their own use and behoof. It can as well deprive the people of one right as of another—of all rights as of one. Is it said "that Congress authorized the establishment of a government?" Yes; but by the people, not by marauders. Is it further said "that we must adhere to a general principle?" What principle? Why, as your whole argument implies, that a government "established" is a government to be recognised. We deny such a government in Kansas. Beware how you stretch a general principle, and make it unicersal. Though one may safely pass the Niagara river at all other points and places, none but a madman would attempt the passage on places, none but a madman would attempt the passage on the verge of the cataract!

Your memorialists urge, therefore, that the so-called government of Kansas can claim no sanction from the act of Congress. The evidence was all against it; evi-dence known to the whole civilized world, apparent on the very face of the transaction, and which must have challenged your attention long before you had taken the oath of office. The very fact that the so-called govern-ment required support from the federal executive was the drongest evidence that it did not come from the people. and had no lawful authority. This shows at once that this government was not, in the lowest sense, what you call an "established government;" for it shows that it was not and could not be established without a United

was not and could not be established without a United States army; and therefore the army was sent, not, as you pretend, to austain an 'established government,' but for the purpose of establishing what was not established—a government of ruffian authority.

Nor could you have been ignorant that the House of Representatives had sent a special committee of investigation to the Territory, and thus acknowledged and confirmed the propriety of a strict inquiry into this very case. On the report of that committee the House of Representatives authoritatively declared that the government of Kansaw was established by the terror of bowie knives and revolvers, and that it had been proved to have not a shadow volvers, and that it had been proved to have not a shadow of authority. And here your memorialists ask, whether a plainer case or stronger evidence can well be imagined? When, if not in such a case, ought the President to de-nounce a government as spurious, and to refuse to aid or sustain it? The laws of Congress trampled in the dust the invaders from Missouri proved, beyond a cavil, to be the invaders from Missouri proved, beyond a cavil, to be the only authors of this "government"—is it not an out-rageous wrong to hold Kansas subject to such usurpation by a United States army? The fires of rufflanism still burn there, smothered in the dreariness of their own desolation, and ready to be rekindled in their fury by the slightest movement for liberty and right on the part of the people; while the echo of their sufferings ever rings in s of our national Executive.

Let it be remembered that this government comes to the people of Kansas not with the sanction of gray anone people of Kansas not with the sanction of gray antiquity; nor yet has it come from any law of Congress, as its true and proper source: nor yet from the people of the Territory; nor yet from being even fully established. It is of recent origin and formation. It dates only from the imposition of it by the ruffianism from Missour upon the people who abhor and discountit. Every man who has, from the first, known its cristage has known its upon the people who abhor and disown it. Every man who has, from the first, known its existace has known its origin and its nature. Let it, then, be taken as it is—as it is in its origin and its nature. And what is it? A code of laws oppressive, unjust, cruel, outrageous, without a parallel, created, imposed by the usurpation of ruffians from Missouri; and these laws, and this "government," without the least evidence to establish their authority, but out the least evidence to establish their authority, but with the most abundant proofs to the contrary, are proposing to sustain and execute by the United army! You speak of "numbers of manages and alluding evidently to the Topeka convention. Be it so, You speak of "numbers of lawless men, for the sake of argument. But how does one "lawless at-tempt" to establish a government justify or palliate another attempt for the same purpose?

Further: In your reply you seem to your memorialists to concede, in all its truth and force, the principle which they maintain. Thus you unequivocally and justly assert that "for a portion of the people of Connecticut to under-take to establish a separate government within its char-tered limits, for the purpose of redressing any grievance, reat or imaginary, would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority and produce universal anarchy." Your memorialists fully subscribe to this doctrine. But what is the act which you call usurpation in the case sup-posed? What is it but setting up a government claiming authority, and laws demanding execution, which, in the the case, can claim no authority and are op nature of osed to existing authority? If you would call this 'usurpation' in Connecticut, if it would 'destroy all "usurpation" in Connecticut, if it would "destroy all legal authority and produce universal anarchy;" what is this but the very act which Missouri invaders have perpe-trated in Kansas? There was government in Kansas; government under the constitution of the United States. aw was there, also-a law for the organization of gov ernment by THE PROPLE OF THE TERRITORY. Right, too ernment by the Prople of the Terretory. Right, too, was there—the inviolable right of the people to make their own laws and elect their own rulers. In opposition to that existing government; in violation of that existing law; trampling upon those inherent rights, Missouri invaders have set up a bloody tyranny, which has in fact produced anarchy and bloodshed. If you condemn the one condemn the other also. Your percentilists have ne, condemn the other also. Your memorialists have nothing to ask of you in this matter but consistency of principle. Condemn the same conduct in both cases; put down the usurpation in Kansas, and the friends of truth, of justice, and of the country, would rejoice.

Your memorialists again ask, whether a case can well

be imagined to which the name of authoritative govern ment could be applied with more palpable impropris sas? Might not even political shamelessness blush to call it by such a name? Was not the true and only character of this government known to you and the whole country before your imauguration, and during the presidential canvass? Did you not, with the full knowledge of it, accept your nomination, which you were free to de-cline, and thus avoid the responsibility of executing those netarious laws; or did you suppose that the eath of office would exempt you from this responsibility? You admit the constitutional duty of the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." And now, with-out holding your responsible for any acts of your predeout holding you responsible for any acts of your predecessor, for which you are not willing to be responsible and have not fully sanctioned, your memorialists would ask, Was there no law to be taken care of by prevent ask, Was there no law to be taken care of by preventing a well-known projected invasion of the political rights of the people of Kansas—no law to be taken care of afterward by expelling the invaders from the Territory—no law to be taken care of in respect to the thefts, the robberies, the incendiarism, and the murthefts, the robberies, the incendiarism, and the murders that were perpetrated—no law to be taken care of in the mode of civil administration adopted by federal officials—no law to be taken care of in not appointing officials whose hands were red with innocent blood, or in removing bribed and perjured judges—no law to be taken care of by securing to the people of the Territory that fundamental right of the constitution—a right guarded by an express law of Congress—the right "to make their own laws and elect their own rulers"—no law to be taken care of in giving to Congress informahad no right to interfere with what was an undeniable usurpation in a foreign kingdom, that the government of the United States had no right, and were not bound to interpose, and put down, in one of their own Territories, a ruffian usurpation from Missouri? In respect to France, there was reason enough why other nations, for purposes of national intercourse, should recognise its present government as an "established governmens." But is not the constitution of the United States the supreme law of the land? Has not our government the right to authorize and regulate the government of its own Territories?

own Territory? In utter neglect of these laws, have you not, with a full knowledge of the harder of this issurpa-tion, its origin, its progress, its violation of the constitu-tion and of fundamental rights, its violence, its rapine,

tion and of fundamental rights, its violence, its rapine, its massacres, its conflagration, and its shame, sustained at every step its authors and abetters to this hour? Have you not sanctioned such conduct by placing or retaining prominent leaders therein in official stations.

Again: are the troubles and calamities of Kansas the legitimate results of the wise administration—of the true and right working in such an exigency—of our national government?—the most perfect specimen of human government the world has ever seem—to our own admiration the perfection of excellence. Surely such results bespeak some derangement, some disturbing force in the evolutions of a machinery so fitted to do good, so powerful to its high design. its high design.

s high design.

But if your example in administration, and that of your But it your example in administration, and thater your predecessor in office, are to be followed in future, when-ever similar cases shall occur; if every usurpation of power, when it has gained a temporary success, is thence-forth to be backed by the whole power of the federal gov-ernment, and forced upon the indignant people on whom, by fraud or violence, it had imposed itself, where will the end be? How often will such crises actually occur, re-visiting from the very mature of our government with end be? How often will such crises actually occur, resulting from the very nature of our government, with such a principle in its administration to originate and foster them? What a temptation to party spirit, thus unrestrained, emboldened, upheld by the government of the nation, would be furnished, to carry out its schemes and its triumphs in violence and bloodshed? What shall hinder? Let the administration of the government-change hands—and such changes may be frequent—how surely would the same contests be re-enacted by way of reprisals for past injuries and oppressions! How would such contests be repeated in Territories and in States till, to your own mind, would be revealed, in the very principle which you assume, a weakness in our government fore-telling its speedy dissolution?

Of the particular considerations by which you have en-

telling its speedy dissolution?

Of the particular considerations by which you have endeavored to support the fundamental principle of your reply, the first which demands notice is that, "when you entered upon your official duties, Congress had recognised the legislature (of Kansas) in different forms and by different engineering in the constant of ferent enactments." Had you informed your meists what these "different enactments" were, they have been made the subject of distinct examination it is, they can only say that they know of no "forms or enactments" of Congress which could be binding on you as authoritative, or which you had reason even to regard as evidence of the validity of that legislature. Do you reas authoritative, or which you had reason even to regard as evidence of the validity of that legislature. Do you refer to the act by which the usual appropriations from the treasury were made? Every one knows in what manner and for what reason that act was passed, and that many who voted for it regarded, and still regard, the territorial legislature as downright usurpation; nor had they amy suspicion that they were recognising its validity. How this bill can invest an act of usurpation with authority your memorialists are unable to discover. What if the legislature of Connecticut had, under the excitement of party strife, even by a formal act, recognised the usurpation which you have supposed; might not the governor justly fall back upon his own official prerogative, call out the militia, and suppress the rebellion? If he would be bound to recognise such a usurpation as government having authority, when could he ever suppress it without himself becoming a rebel against the very authority which he recognises? Apply this illustration to the President of the United States, and you will see that the fundamental principle of all your reasoning is absolutely suicidal, and thus renders nugatory your entire vindication. Did not President Jackson, on his own official responsibility as national Executive, set at define a second of the united stream, and the support of a "severeign" are all the prover and the authority of a "severeign" tire vindication. Did not President Jackson, on his own official responsibility as national Executive, set at defiance alike the power and the authority of a "sovereign State?" And can a territorial government rank with an independent State sovereignty? Can border ruffianism, by any act of Congress, become entitled to respect and support, as a rightful law-making power, from the President of the United States? The case is too flagrant. The dent of the United States? The case is too flagrant. The facts are too notorious. No truly independent, self-rely-ing President, who understood his official prerogative, and his duty under the constitution, would have hesitated to disregard even a direct act of Congress so tyrannical and oppressive, and appeal to his country and the world for

But no such trying emergency was here presented. With the solemn decision of the House of Representatives, after long, investigation, that the legislature of Kansas had no afthority, and that its laws were no laws—with that direct, positive, and unimpeachable evidence before you, your memorialists cannot but express their surprise that you have relied upon your construction of indirect, inconclusive acts of that same body as evidence of the authority of that legislature. They know of no rule of law which you can set up constructive, inferential evidence

thority of that legislature. They know of no rule of law by which you can set up constructive, inferential evidence against direct and positive evidence from the same source. But this proof you pass over in utter silence?

Alluding to the condition of the Territory, you speak of the course which you adopted as "absolutely necessary;" and ask whether "you would not have been justly condemned had you left" what you assume to be the government and its administration "impotent," and thus have suffered it to become an "object of contempt in the eyes of the people?" Our first reply to this view of the case is, as before, there was no (territorial) government in Kansas to be executed, as you suppose. And, again, we case is, as before, there was no (territorial) government in Kansas to be executed, as you suppose. And, again, we say the usurped government ought to have been rendered impotent, and to have become an object of contempt, in the eyes of the people, as it has become. But, further, Congress had passed a law for the establishment of a govthe eyes of the people, as it has become. But, further, Congress had passed a law for the establishment of a government in this Territory, with this formal and positive explanation that the people (in the Territory) be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. Why, then, could not a governor of Kansas have been appointed at any time, acting under your authority, and with an army under his control, who would have suppressed all internal violence and contention, and "left the people free to form and regulate their domestic institutions." &c. as well as employ the army to act the "left the people free to form and regulate their domestic institutions," &c., as well as employ the army to act the absurd and farcical part of a posse comitatus to enforce, un-der your direction, territorial laws which had no pretence of authority? Without saying who were or who were not the responsible originators of the troubles in Kansas, can it be doubted that the President, long before this time, by the course now suggested, or some other, might have put an end to these troubles? Has he not power to "take care that the laws"—and, of course, that the law of Congress respecting Kansas—"be faithfully exe-

You have introduced several topics into your reply. that of slavery, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott, with others, on which your memorial-

case of Dred Scott, with others, on which your memorialists have said nothing in their memorial, and on which they intend to say nothing now, except to express their dissent from your opinions.

It is needless to prolong this discussion. Your whole vindication, if it has any ground, rests, in the view of your memorialists, upon one palpably-false assumption: That whatever claims to be a government de facto, with the processing from any sightful law. out a pretence of its proceeding from any rightful law-making power, is entitled to your support. The world has not seen a usurpation which this principle would not anction. If adopted in the administration of our gov rnment it must involve, sooner or later, its destru

Pardon now, if need be, the plain and respectful earnestness of your memorialists in unfolding what they consider false principles in your positions on the present subject. They speak of no want of honesty in your opinions, nor of sincerity in your avowal of them—of ne want of patriotism on your part, nor yet of that higher patriotism which God approves. They speak only of what they consider error in your reasonings, and of its consequences in political evils. They judge not the heart. They have not imputed to you any violation of your oath of office, as you have thought fit to charge. Their language shows the contrary. They said, "by the foregoing' here spoken of is shown by the connexion to be the drin of Gov. Walker that "the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." This claim ons, nor of sincerity in your avowal of them-of ne wan which it is notorious, and established upon evimence, they never made, and rulers they never elected. "This claim of Gov. Walker, if admitted by you in its full extent, and admitted on the ground of making the general principle mentioned above a universal one—thus applying a mere rule of international law to the internal government of this country—would, in our view, involve the most serious imputations upon any chief magistrate. But you had not at that time, so far as we are aware, given any public sanction to that claim, and the memorial, there-fore, did not contain the imputation you supposed.

The memorialists have dwelt on the error referred to above, as they regard it not merely on account of its fa-tal tendency, and the calamities which have actually re-sulted from it, but also because they are confident that you, in common with many of your honest fellow-citi-zens, have overlooked one essential principle in assu-ming that the ruffian usurpation in Kansas is "an estab-lished government." Be assured that they intend to withhold no tribute due to your intellectual eminence or moral character. They believe, however, that many errors and misconceptions are compatible with the highes mental culture and intellectual ability.

Mental culture and intellectual ability.

Your memorialists have spoken earnestly, because they deeply deplore the adoption of a principle which leads to the mal-administration of so perfect a system of government as that which our fathers, by their wisdom, their prayers, and their blood, have given to fraudulent means.

their posterity. They cannot believe in the unap-proachable infallibility of their rulers, under this system of true liberty; and, while they would honor them in the fear of God, they are confident that neither they, the lear of God, they are confident that neither they, nor even "kings," have the right divine to govern wrong. They hope for the continuance of our national government, and for its wise and effective administration, in guarding the privileges and blessings it is so fitted to afford and perpetuate. They wait with hope for the emancipation of the nations and of all men by the light and power of the example of such a government. They trust that no unauthorized mode of its administration will cause it to fall of its design, and they want ways the second that we have the same its fall of its design, and they want was the same its fall of its design, and they want was the same its fall of its design, and they want was the same in the same its fall of its design, and they want was the same its fall of cause it to fail of its design, and that you may yet see that in this respect one false principle, if adhered to, must prove a principle of weakness and decay—a sure prelude to the end of all our greatness, happiness, and glory—a death-spot in the Tree of Liberty; whose leaves, like those of the Tree of Life, are for the healing of the nations.

S. G. Hubbard, John A. Blake, Wm. H. Russell, A. N. Skinner, Nathaniel W. Taylor, Theo. D. Woolsey, John H. Brockway, Charles Robinson Joel Hawes, G. A. Calho Eli W. Blake Benj. Silliman, jr Thos. A. Thacher Leonard Bacon, H. C. Kingsley, J. A. Davenport, Worth'n Hooker, Benj. Silliman, sr Charles Ives, Josiah W. Gibbs, Jas. F. Babcock, Amos Townsend James Brewster, Alfred Walker

### DEPARTMENT NEWS.

Port of Amoy .- Imports -A correspondent, under date of July 4, writes that among the principal articles imported into Amoy during the year 1856, in British yessels, were 11,527 bales of cotton, 12,950 pieces of long cloths, 2,485 bales of cotton-yarn, and 64 bales of cotton thread. None of these articles were brought direct from England, or other distant countries, but from Hong-Kong, Singapore, &c.; so that it does not appear what proportion of these articles are of American production Most of the raw cotton is probably from India, and the

yarn and long cloths chiefly from the United States. Of the principal articles exported from Amoy in Brit ish vessels are China ware-in value \$86,458; sugar, £52,969; sugar-cane, \$127,647; tea, \$51,967; tobacco. \$12,770 : rice, \$227,647. The exportation of rice is now prohibited by the Chinese authorities.

Among the articles imported no mention is made of the drug opium, (it being a contraband article,) though the quantity imported into Amoy probably amounts in value to more than all other British imports combined.

### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Appropriation Estimates.—The estimates of the appropria tions required to meet expenses of the General Land Of ors general, for surveying the public lands in the variou States and Territories, and for expenses of collecting the revenue from rules of public lands, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1859, have all been prepared and sent to the Secretary of the Interior prior to being submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury to be printed and laid before Congress at the commencement of its next session.

New York Indian Reservation in Kansas, -Instruction have just been issued by the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the register of the land office at Fort Scott, Kansas, relative to the above reservation, to the effect that the Indian title to the lands lying in that reserve not having as yet been extinguished, no pre-emption applications should be entertained by the register to the lands lying within the same.

The reservation comprises a strip of land in the south eastern part of Kansas extending from nearly middle of township 23 south, in range 8 east, to the western bound ary of the State of Missouri.

The Pulgas Ranche, California. - The General Land Office s about to issue a patent for the Pulgas ranche in California, which was finally confirmed to Maria de la Sole dad Ortega de Arguelo and others at the December term of 1855. This tract lies on the bay of San Francisco, between the San Mateo and San Francisquito creeks. I contains an area of 35,240 47-100 acres. The confirmeer get the following proportions: Maria de la Soledad Orte go de Arguelo, one half; José Ramon Arguello, one fourth : Luis Antonio Arguello, one tenth ; and S M. Meses, three twentieths. The survey embraces two hundred and twenty-two courses, making it a very lengthy patent, covering thirteen sheets of parchment, exclusive of the transfer plats. These parties are the descendants of the original grantee under the Spanish government, the grant having already been confirmed to them by the Mexican government, and now by the Supreme Court of

## NAVY DEPARTMENT.

The United States Ship Germantown. - The Navy Department has received a letter from Commander Page, of the Holted States ship Germantown in which that officer reports that he had arrived at Funchal, Maderia, on the 0th ult., after a passage of 24 days from the United States. The officers and crew were in good health. The Germantown would leave for her destination (China) in a few days, after taking in wood and water. Commander Page states that the governor has been exceedingly adly towards Americans.

The Coast of Africa. - The Secretary of the Navy received yesterday morning a letter from Flag Officer Conover commanding the naval forces stationed on the coast of Africa. That officer reports that he arrived at Porto Grande on the 25th ult. in the flag-ship Cumberland. The Dale had sailed from that port on the 18th ult. for the mouth of Congo river and St. Paul de Loando, on the west coast of Africa. The St. Louis was to sail for Cape Palmas and Cape Mesurado in a few days, whence she would return to Cape Verde islands by the 1st of November. The sick men were transferred to the St. Louis, in which, together with six American citizens found in dis tress, they will be sent to the United States. Flag Officer Conover proposed to proceed down the coast and return in December next.

Mrs. Catharine Sinclair, sometimes Mrs. Edwin Forrest, is playing at the Haymarket in London. She made her debut on the 7th instant as "Beatrice" in "Much Ado About Nothing." The Daily News says that she had a warm and flattering reception. "Although not altogether the gay, witty, riante Beatrice that Shakspeare drew, she bids fair to obtain a permanent footing on the metropolitan beards. Her features are marked and expressive, and her figure good, although inclining considerably to the embonyonit, and her acting is distinguished by considerable vivacity, coupled with an intimate acquaintance with the business of the stage. Still, the truth must be told, she is a little too mature and womanly for the youthful Beatrice, and throws, consequently, more physi-Mrs. Catharine Sinclair, sometimes Mrs. Edwin Forrest youthful Beatrice, and throws, consequently, more pl cal force into the character than it is to be believed the cal force into the character than it is to be believed the au-thor intended. There are many characters, however, in the high comedy in which her fine presence, great flow of animal spirits, and obvious stage experience, may be brought out with advantage. The impression she made on the audience last evening was decidedly favorable; and at the end of one scene she was recalled and warmly probabile.

The New York Herald says: "It was thought that the recent trip of the Americus Engine Company No. 6 to Canada was about as extensive an excursion as it was posrecent trip of the Americus Engine Company No. 6 to Canada was about as extensive an excursion as it was possible for a New York fire company to make, involving, as it did, an expenditure of over \$100 by each person, besides the loss of time; but it seems the members of Columbia Engine Company No. 14 contemplate something far more extensive—nothing less, in fact, than a visit to Europe, which will take place probably during the ensuing spring. A meeting of the members of the company was held a few evenings since, and thirty-three of them expressed their willingness to go on the proposed excursion. The projectors are sanguine that 100 firemen will volunteer for the trip. It is proposed to visit London, where the lions will be looked up; after which a flying trip will be made across the channel; and, if the Columbians feel good natured, they may wait upon the Emperor and tender him their compliments. Next week 14 engine is to be sent to Philadelphia, where she is to be rebuilt and redecorated, so as to do credit to the New York fire department in the Old World." York fire department in the Old World.

The notorious Plin White was arrested in New York on Monday, on a charge of having swindled a firm of bro-kers out of \$47,000, by exhibiting a certified check on the Suffolk Bank, Boston, for \$100,000, and by other

## WASHINGTON CITY.

SATURDAY MORNING, SEPT. 26, 1857.

SW-Mr. ISBARD, E. JAMES, of Philadelphia, is our general travelling ont, assisted by James Demons, John Collins, J. Harmyr, Edmunt Wiley, John K. Demong, E. A. Evans, R. S. James, T. Assisan, P. i. Davis, H. T. Romests.

\*\*Thr. C. W. James, No. 1 Harrison street, Cincinnati, Ohio, is compared to the company of the compa ting agent for the Western States and Texas, a

H. J. THOMAS WILLIAM H. THOMAS, THOS. M. JAMES, Dr. A. L. CHILDS

EE MORRIS, and RICHARD LEAKE. Receipts of either will be good.

#### THE CONNECTICUT CLERGYMEN AGAIN.

After a portentous silence of some weeks, a portion of the Connecticut gentlemen who recently memorialized the President of the United States, upon the subject of Kansas affairs, have again addressed him, and made his answer to their first letter the special theme of their criticism and uncharitable animadversion. Wrong at first, they still continue so. Their long deliberation and consultation have not enabled them to mend their position in the least. The President, in his reply, did the work effectuallyleft them no solid, stable ground to stand uponand all the mental efforts of sundry doctors of law, doctors of divinity, professors and scholars have not improved the position which they occupy before the country. That position is truly a bad one. It is a bad one for any citizen; it is worse for scholars and philosophers; but it is worst of all, and absolutely inexcusable, for clergymen and teachers of religion. Their conduct teaches a bad noral. Their example is pernicious. Their influence, so far as they have any, is opposed to peace, order, and obedience to the laws. Indeed, their bill of indictment against the President is founded chiefly on the fact that he was using the lawful power of the government to preserve peace and order in Kansas, to suppress insurrection, and to insure the full and proper execution of the laws. It is this constant interference on the part of men

of the clerical profession with the policy of the government; this constant meddling and mixing themselves up in the recking and unscrupulous partisan politics of the day; this constant exhibition of that worldly, ambitious, and restless spirit which is opposed to the peaceful spirit of Heaven, that is gradually, but surely, undermining the great temple of religion, weakening and breaking down those great moral safeguards to society, without which society indeed could scarcely exist. Its fruits are visible on all sides. The grossest examples of impiety and mmorality are now being found in the persons of men covered with the grave robes of the clerical profession. Rapes, seductions, and fornications by such men, are but the moral sequences of their political strifes and worldly tastes, and the natural results of their evil teaching, instead of the teaching of the Bible. The newspapers are perpetually recording examples of the grossest immorality and vice on the part of such reverend delinquents; and one of the most astounding and pregnant circumstances of the times, connected with a case of this kind, is the fact, that the congregation to which he belonged refused to dismiss the clerical culprit, although adultery was proved upon him.

Now, we are not charging upon the learned Conecticut clergymen, who are concerned in bringing false charges against the President, the crimes of adultery, fornication, and seduction, but we are only illustrating, by example, the natural effect of their conduct and teachings upon society and upon themselves. But even if their individual conduct is less flagrant, it is scarcely less excusable; and the sooner they confine themselves to their appropriate duties, and leave the President to the proper discharge of his, the better it will be for themselves and others.

But the Journal of Commerce has so ably and appropriately discussed the merits of this last performance (which will be found in another part of the paper) of the reverend gentlemen of Connecticut, that we fully adopt its reasonings, and give the article to our readers.

#### ANOTHER CHANCE FOR THE SHRIEKERS. The last Congress, it will be remembered, organ-

ized a new Territory under the name of Dacotah. This Territory (says the Albany Argus) includes a

# WHAT DO THESE THINGS MEAN?

We find the following in a late number of the New York Evangelist :

"Vermont, one of the most purely agricultural States in the Union, exhibits sad evidences of religious indiffer-

ence. The annual report of the general convention in that State discloses the following fact, published in the Congregational (N. H.) Journal: "More than 20,000 families in Vermont habitually

neglect all public worship; only about one-fifth of the people in the average attend upon evangelical worship and four-fifths of the inhabitants on each returning Lord's day are absent from the sanctuary. What do these thing mean? Making all due allowance for the necessary at mean? Making all due allowance for the necessary ab-sence of those who, in the Providence of God, cannot be present, there ought to be at least three-fifths instead of one-fifth of the people at public worship. Where, then, are the 150,000 souls that ought to be in the house of God every Sabbath? What are their thoughts and deeds on God's holy day?"

The Boston Courier has the following comments n the above :

"The New York Evangelist (a religious paper inclining to anti-slavery) ought not to ask: 'What do these things means?' as if the reason were not perfectly obvious. That abolitionism would inevitably lead to such a sad result has been preached upon the house-tops. The Courier, with other conservative journals, has never Courier, with other conservative journais, has never ceased to urge entreaties and warnings upon the subject for a year past. Many of the clergy, with a real quite surpassing their religious ministrations, have entered into abolitionism in the pulpit, directly or indirectly; and out of the pulpit have too often set examples of par-tisanship to their people. Abolitionism is not religion; but, like all other fanaticism, it is an absorbing delusion. The human mind cannot be full of one engrossing topic and find room for another. The consequence is that ab-olitionism in Vermont, and elsewhere, has excluded Christianity. The process of operation is—first, luke-warmness, then neglect of religious ordinances, then disbellef. And yet the New York Evangelist, adopting the report of the convention, innocently asks, What do these things mean ?" TONNAGE DUTIES IN CHILL

Recent dates from Chili announce the promulga tion of a new law imposing additional toppage duties upon vessels entering Chilian ports, the net amount of which is to be applied to the construction and support of light-houses. We are uninformed as to the amount of these duties, but as the Chilian law of July 16, 1850, abrogates a law in force from January 8, 1834, imposing upon all foreign flags differential duties in favor of the national flag, the amount. whatever it may be, cannot be considered in the light of an unjust or oppressive tax, since it applies by virtue of the law above cited, to all equalized flags, national as well as foreign. The existing tonnage duties are, on vessels of nations having treaties of reciprocity, or that have accepted the Chilian reciprocity law of July 16, 1850, 25 cents per ton of the vessels' measurement. On all other vessels, 75 cents per ton. This reciprocity law of 1850 was accepted on behalf of the United States by President's roclamation bearing date November 1, 1850.

THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS IN MINNESOTA

The St. Paul Pioneer of the 18th inst. contains an elaborate and ably-written notice of the several candidates recently placed in nomination by the democratic State convention of Minnesota. The Pioneer

"The first democratic State convention of Minnesota closed its session on Wednesday evening, the 27th inst. From the intelligence and sound democracy of its members, and the harmony of its deliberations, the gratifying result which had been anticipated in the selection of an able ticket for the support of the democracy has been fully realized. We refer with pride to the names and character of the men who have been chosen as the champions of the democracy in the coming contest. The ticket presents a rare combination of talent, experience, and that sound and growing popularity which rests on the basis of personal and political integrity. It is, as a whole, a fair representation of the honesty and intelligence of a party which comprises within its ranks, in a superior degree, the intelligence and honesty of our people. We shall present this morning as full sketches of some of the candidates nominated as our acquaintance and the limits of our columns will permit." and the limits of our columns will permit.

Of the democratic nominee for governor the Pion

"The Hon. Henry H. Sibley, of Dakota county, nominee for governor, was born in the Territory of Mich-igan, and removed from thence to the spot where he now der in the autumn of 1834, nearly twenty-three resides in the autumn of 1834, nearly twenty-three years ago. The reputation for talents and integrity which Mr. Sibley bore as a young man will be appreciated from the fact that he was placed at the head of the entire business of the American Fur Company throughout this region when only twenty-two years of age."

The Pioneer closes its interesting biographical sketch of Mr. Sibley with the following remarks:

"There is a propriety in the nomination of Mr. Sibley as candidate for the first governorship of the State of Minnesota which must meet with general and cordial ap-preciation. It is fit that the man whose efforts secured s existence as a Territory should become the recipient of he first and highest honors within the gift of our new

Of the candidates for representatives in Congress Messrs, G. L. Becker, W. W. Phelps, and James M Cavanaugh, the Pioneer speaks in the warmest terms of commendation. Of the condidate for delegate to Congress the same paper has the following notice :

"The convention, since the opposition have done so, deemed it necessary to nominate a candidate for territorial delegate, and for this position placed in nomination William W. Kingsbury, of the north shore of Lake Superior. We confess to a peculiar feeling of gratification at this nomination. Mr. K. was one of the first white settlers on the 'north shore;' he has experienced and appreciates the difficulties and hardships attendant upon the settlement of a new country, and if elected will, we believe, devote his energies to the accomplishment of believe, devote his energies to the accomplishment of whatever may be necessary for their welfare. Mr. Kingsbury is a thorough-going democrat; a gentleman of genial social qualities, and of great decision of character."

THE SECOND ATTEMPT OF THE RIFLE RETGADE The following appears in the New Haven (Connecticut) Register of last Wednesday's issue. As the Register is published in the vicinage of the forty-odd philosophers and divines, its comments, in this instance, may not prove uninteresting to the

general reader :

THE FORTY PHILOPHERS AGAIN.—Some twenty-eight of the "forty-two memorialists" to President Buchanan have been for the last fortnight in labor over what it was best to reply to the President's recent letter, and after mercifully giving the public several hours' warning of the event upon the Palladium bulletin-board, the anxiously-awaited reply appeared last evening in a ponderous thesis on government dt. foto and de intre occurring four solid on government ds facto and de jure, occupying four solid columns of the Palladium. It is reported that this pro-duction comes from the pen of Rev. Dr. Taylor, of Yale College. We haven't a doubt of the fact. There is about columns of the Palladium. It is reported that this production comes from the pern of Rev. Dr. Taylor, of Yale College we haven't a doubt of the fact. There is about it all that technical ability, with want of tact, and lack of "wordly wisdom," which ordinarily distinguishes one of the faculty of that venerable institution outside of the faculty within the faculty of that venerable institution outside of the faculty within the faculty of that venerable institution outside of the faculty within the faculty within

#### TEXAS AFFAIRS The Galveston News of the 17th says:

"After a series of heavy rains for ten days, weather has again cleared up since two days. Some fears are en-tertained that rain must have done severe injury to cot-ton; as far as accounts have been received, they show that extreme wet weather was confined to the coast. The prospect of the sugar crop in Brazoria county has

rther improved.
"Brazos river is reported in boating order; from Trinwe have not heard of a rise sufficient for moving

"The receipts of new cotton amount to about 900 bales

"The receipts of new cotton amount to about 900 bales, and increasing deliveries are in prospect.
"We noticed some time since a report that an arrangement was being made between the Galveston, Houston, and Henderson Railroad Company and Mr. Vanderbilt for the purpose of epening a channel from this city to Virginia Point. We are now authorized to state that said company neither have nor will engage in any such enterprise, but that they have determined on building the bridge, and of this fact the public will soon be relieved of all doubt."

The Galvestan Civilian publishes the vote for congressman in the eastern district. It sums up as folows: Reagan, (dem.,)15,056; Evans, (k. n.,) 9,853. Majority for Reagan, 5,293.

The last Asheville (North Carolina) News cont and a long and interesting letter from the Hon. Thomas L. Clingman in relation to the Black mountain and the explorations and measurements made of it at various times.

Mormonism in New York city has run out; the Mormon newspaper is dead; and when the congregation gathered in their meeting-house in Broome street on Monday they were told there would be no more Mormon preaching there.